



# **RFDP 0517-18-GMHS-PPEA GEORGE MASON HIGH SCHOOL DESIGN & CONSTRUCTION – DETAILED**

Date: April 10, 2018

## **ADDENDUM No. 2**

To: **ALL PROSPECTIVE BIDDERS**

**THIS ADDENDUM MUST BE SIGNED AND RETURNED WITH YOUR BID**

### **QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS:**

- Q1: The Feasibility Study notes soft costs (A/E fee, CM fee, FF&E, and utility and permitting fees) of approximately \$13.8M are in addition to the estimated construction cost of \$110M. The RFP states the Contract Cost Limitation (CCL) shall not exceed \$108M, and Attachment A1 includes A/E fee, Contractor's fee, permitting fees, and utility fees as part of the CCL. Please confirm the RFP's \$108M cost limit is to include these fees, and therefore is a reduced construction cost.
- A1: The Construction Cost Limit of \$108 Million is inclusive of the A/E Fee, Contractor's Fee, Utility Connection Fees, and Permitting Fees. The Construction Cost Limit does not include CM Fees or FF&E Costs.
- Q2: We have not received the link to existing documents listed in RFP paragraph 1.22. Please provide.
- A2: Please provide the email addresses of your employees who need access to the documents to Jim Wise, Purchasing Agent. FCCPS will then provide those individuals access to the Google Team drive that contains the documents.
- Q3: Would FCCPS consider conducting soil borings and sharing the results with the design/build teams? This will prevent the three teams from each doing their own investigation and disrupting school activities.
- A3: No.
- Q4: Will a stipend for the work effort during this RFP Detailed Phase be provided to the design/build teams?
- A4: No.
- Q5: Who will own the on-site roads (FCCPS, CFC, Developer, or VDOT)? Question applies to east-west "School Street" and north-south street from Falls Church Drive to Leesburg Pike. Will the school or economic development project pay for the road construction?
- A5: The Private Entity is responsible for all roadways, based on the proposed design solution, contained on the school site. Roadways on the Commercial Development site are not the responsibility of the Private Entity. The Private Entity may base their proposals on the existing access drive from Haycock

Road remaining as is. Any improvements to the access drive from Haycock Road will be the responsibility of the Commercial Development developer.

Q6: Do existing curb cuts along Leesburg Pike have to be maintained?

A6: Curb cuts will depend on proposer's design solution and the final design that is approved.

Q7: Will the school or economic development project pay for the underground utilities below the roads?

A7: The Private Entity is responsible for providing all utilities necessary to serve the school campus.

Q8: Please provide the geothermal well test report or let us know when that will be provided (ref RFP 1.22.10).

A8: This document can be accessed via the Google Team drive. If you have questions regarding access, please contact Jim Wise, Purchasing Agent.

Q9: At the pre-proposal meeting, it was mentioned that FCCPS will provide a site survey which includes the 10-acre line, easements, encumbrance, utilities, etc. Please provide or let us know when that will be provided.

A9: We anticipate this will be available in another week. When available, it will be added to the Google Team drive.

Q10: Does the property line dividing the 10-acre and 24-acre sites have to remain in the location shown in the Feasibility Study?

A10: We do not anticipate that it will be possible to change the property dividing line.

Q11: How many total parking spaces (including GMHS and MEHMS) need to be maintained during construction? Also, how many busses need to be accommodated at one time during construction?

A11: During construction, the Private Entity shall maintain a minimum of 450 parking spaces on the school campus along with parking for 19 buses.

Q12: Please expand upon the Evaluation Factor 9.2.4 "Technology – Understanding of Technology Requirements".

A12: Evaluation Factor 9.2.4, regarding Understanding of Technology Requirements, is an evaluation of the Private Entity's understanding of the Technology requirements contained in the RFP. This is expected to be a narrative, or other illustration, of the project Technology Requirements. Technology includes Telecommunications, Intercom System, Security CCTV, and Door Access System as detailed in the Education Specifications (RFP Attachment A4). By way of further clarification, the technology requirements are contained in the Education Specifications page 3-4 and on each room data sheet.

Q13: The Feasibility Study included space for a future natatorium. Please confirm this is not a requirement of the RFP.

A13: A natatorium is not a requirement of this RFP.

Q14: At the pre-proposal meeting, it was mentioned that confidential meetings will occur with each of the design/build teams. Please provide date(s) for the meetings, agenda, attendees, etc., so that we may prepare and get the most of the meeting.

A14: These meetings were held on April 3 and 4.

Q15: RFP item 3.4 states there may or may not be interviews. Could you provide a timeframe for interviews in the event they do occur?

A15: FCCPS is planning to schedule interviews in early June. Prior to the interviews, each proposer will provide a public presentation of their proposed design solution, the content of which will be determined by the proposer.

Q16: RFP Attachment A2 Section 8 states FCCPS will consider relocating bus parking to an alternate site owned by the City. Is there an alternate location identified yet and can you share this with us?

A15: We have not yet identified an alternative location. As a result, the bus parking must be addressed per the requirements in the RFP.

Q17: The RFP does not specify which content goes in which section. Are we supposed to follow in order the numbering starting at Section 8.4 of the RFP continuing through 8.21? Or follow in order the Evaluation Factors starting with 9.2 through 9.4? If we follow the proposal content structure, we will miss some of the items listed in the evaluation factors. Example: understanding of project financing is listed as evaluation factor 9.3.1 but there's no mention of project financing in the proposal content. Additionally, while the RFP references the PPEA Guidelines, neither the proposal content list nor evaluation factors align with the PPEA Guidelines for proposal submissions.

A17: The proposal should be structured generally as indicated in Section 8. The financing referenced in Section 9.3.1 can be included in the Project Understanding.

Q18: Does the placement of the fields and building need to remain where it is located on the feasibility study?

A18: No. The placement of the fields and building is dependent on the proposed design solution, however, they must remain on the school campus site.

Q19: When will the site survey be available?

A19: We anticipate that it will be available and posted to the shared drive this week with the electronic version to follow. If you have questions regarding accessing the shared drive, please contact Jim Wise, Purchasing Agent.

Q20: Will the site survey include a survey of on-site utilities?

A20: Yes

Q21: Will the site survey include a topographic survey?

A21: No

Q22: When will the geothermal conductivity test be available? How many boreholes were drilled?

A22: One test well was drilled and results are available now. If you have questions regarding accessing the shared drive, please contact Jim Wise, Purchasing Agent.

Q23: Can the geotechnical report completed as part of the original middle school project be made available? Were infiltration tests performed at that time?

A23: The Geotech from the Middle School could not be located.

Q23: Are additional geotechnical surveys being conducted at this time? If so, when will they be available?

A24: None are being conducted, and as a result are not available.

Q24: What sports requiring team dressing rooms are played by boys and girls in each of the three seasons? How many lockers are required for football?

A24: Education Specification requires 100 team lockers sized for football. Mason's athletics teams are available at: <https://masonathletics.org/?action=main.allteams>

Q25: What is the difference between the "separation wall" called for between the art rooms and the "convenient acoustical divider" called for between two of the classrooms in the English department?

A25: Art room separation wall is a full height partition that divides two art classrooms  $\frac{3}{4}$  the span of the space (1/4 of the room is open to the adjacent art classroom). Classroom dividers are movable and provide full space and sound separation.

Q26: Does the district have any objection to adding trees to the landscape?

A26: The scope of work provides a preference and goal for additional trees.

Q27: LOCKERS – Current requirements indicate full height lockers in corridors. Is that required?

A27: The project requirements will be revised to accept other locker configurations including limited (200-300) "bus stop" style lockers or other height lockers.

Q28: CMU INTERIOR WALLS – Can interior demising walls be something other than CMU?

A28: Exterior walls should remain CMU. We are open to other materials for demising walls. We are interested in additional flexibility, durability and long-term sustainability, and saving construction cost both in CMU and a lighter building structure.

Q29: SOFTBALL FIELD – The RFP states that if the softball field is relocated, it must be increased from 200' to 275'. Is there any flexibility with the size?

A29: The Project Requirements will be revised to change the Softball Field from 275' to 200'.

Q30: TENNIS COURTS – Is a contiguous layout required?

A30: We are open to having the tennis courts be split into a group of 4 and a group of 2, but the court groups still need close proximity for tournaments and for a potential bubble.

Q31: METRO ROAD – Will the site have access to the METRO access road?

A31: We will discuss this access with the City, but proposals should not assume that it will be available.

- Q32: VISITATION – May we have exterior access to the site without prescheduling a visit?
- A32: Your team may visit the **exterior** of the site without an appointment providing they check in with security when first arriving at the school and that the visit does not impact school operations/activities. **Interior** access must be scheduled in advance.
- Q33: PERMIT REVIEWS – Are there guarantees on the permit time from the City?
- A33: We will discuss permit review times with the City, and see if it will be possible to incorporate anticipated times in the final agreement. This is the largest project in the City's history and we are confident that we will receive their support for the project.
- Q34: Comprehensive Agreement Section 2.7.7 – Isn't the cost at this point no longer an estimate?
- A34: Yes, we will remove the word "estimated" in front of Cost of Work.
- Q35: Comprehensive Agreement Section 2.15.2 – The language "or which should have been identified" is unclear.
- A35: We will remove "or which should have been identified" resulting in anything not shown in the Asbestos Report is an unforeseen condition.
- Q36: MASONRY VENEER – Would alternatives to masonry be accepted?
- A36: Yes, we are open to alternate exterior materials with the understanding that durability and the long-term viability of the building will be considered as well. **In general, the majority of the building exterior should remain masonry.**
- Q37: UTILITY COSTS – Please provide utility costs for GMHS & MEHMS.
- A37: The utility costs are being added to the shared drive. If you have questions regarding accessing the shared drive, please contact Jim Wise, Purchasing Agent.
- Q38: If we drill geothermal in an athletic field, will we need to upgrade the field?
- A38: No, you will not need to upgrade the field, but you will be required to restore the field to its prior condition.
- Q39: Are there requirements for the site to be an emergency shelter?
- A39: There are no additional requirements relating to the site being an emergency shelter.
- Q40: Is the fireflow data available?
- A40: Yes, it has been posted to the shared drive. If you have questions regarding accessing the shared drive, please contact Jim Wise, Purchasing Agent.
- Q41: Is "school street" as shown in the feasibility site a public road?
- A41: "School street" is not a public road.
- Q42: Do the outdoor basketball courts need to remain at the middle school?
- A42: The courts were recently resurfaced and are currently used, but we will be flexible in considering alternatives.

Q43: Will the project move forward if a master developer is not selected for the economic development site?

A43: It has been publically stated that we will move forward with the school construction after the master developer for the economic development site has been selected.

Q44: Has the City looked at the sewer capacity on Leesburg Pike?

A44: The City has confirmed the existing Sewer Main in Leesburg Pike has the capacity for the High School Project.

**ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN UNCHANGED AND IN FULL FORCE & EFFECT.**

Contractor must take due notice and be governed accordingly. This Addendum is considered a part of the above referenced solicitation.

**Acknowledged by:**

---

Name of Firm

---

Authorized Signature

---

Date